

REMARKS

Claims 1-48 are pending in the application. Claim 48, which recites features similar to originally presented claims 4 and 25, has been added. No new matter has been added, and the addition of this claim does not introduce new issues that would require further search/and or consideration.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 22-27, 43 and 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thankachan et al. (US Publication 2002/0184317) (“Thankachan”) in view of Larky et al (US Patent No. 6,970,908) (“Larky”). Claims 7-12 and 28-33 are rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thankachan and Larky in view of Danon (US Publication 2003/0110211) (“Danon”) and Davis et al. (US Publication 2004/0158610) (“Davis”). Claims 13 and 34 stand rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thankachan in view of Larky and Danon. Claims 14-18, 35-39 and 44 stand rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thankachan and Larky in view of Atencio et al. (US Publication 2004/0210450) (“Atencio”). Claims 19, 20, 40 and 41 stand rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thankachan and Larky in view of Roskind et al. (US Publication 2004/0128540) (“Roskind”). Claims 21 and 42 stand rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thankachan, Larky and Roskind in view of Weiss (US Patent 6,930,598) (“Weiss”). These rejectionns are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method for providing search and reference functions for a messaging system. The method comprises receiving a request to search a data archive for reference information relating to at least one keyword selected by a messaging system user. The messaging system user is actively engaged in composing a message or a response to a message. The at least one keyword is selected from a body of said message's text. The method further comprises searching the data archive, and, if a reference is found, presenting the reference to the messaging system user within the message. The data archive includes information gathered from the messaging system user's message folder and at least one of a local data storage system and a shared online repository.

An illustrative example of the subject matter claimed is described, e.g., in paragraph 25 and depicted in FIG. 5 of this application.

Thankachan discloses a system and method for searching, retrieving, and displaying data from an email storage location. As described, e.g., in the Abstract of Thankachan, a search feature locates and retrieves data from stored email messages based upon a user-input search parameter, and the retrieved data is inserted into a newly created document. As admitted at page 3 of the Office Action, Thankachan does not disclose the messaging system user actively engaged in composing a message or a response to a message, wherein at least one keyword is selected from a body of the message's text, and, if a message is found, presenting the reference to the message system user within the message as set forth in claim 1. The Action relies on Larky for this feature missing from Thankachan.

Larky discloses a method for email attachment confirmation. In particular, the Action points to FIG. 3B and col. 11, ll. 23-25 and 46-60 of Larky as allegedly showing that at least one keyword is selected from a body of a message's text. These portions of Larky describe and illustrate an email message 300 containing text 311 and analyzing the message text by parsing its syntactic content, comparing its syntactic content to the syntax database, and generating a syntactic comparison which may indicate the desirability of an attachment. While this portion of Larky indicates that the syntax database may be a list of specified terms, which may be considered keywords, nothing in this portion or any other portion of Larky discloses or suggests at least one keyword selected from a body of the message's text as set forth in claim 1. Further, the Action relies on FIG. 3C, col. 11, ll. 39-46 and col. 12, ll. 5-15 as allegedly showing that if a reference is found, presenting the reference to the messaging system user within the message. These portions of Larky describe and illustrate how message text 311 is analyzed by parsing its syntactic content and how a pop-up screen is generated to prompt the user that he/she is attempting to send a message with no attachment, although syntactic elements within the text indicate that an attachment may be desirable. Nothing in this portion or any other portion of Larky describes or suggests if a reference is found, presenting the reference to the message system user within the message as set forth in claim 1. Thus, Larky fails to make up for the deficiencies of Thankachan. Accordingly, claim 1 is considered allowable over any combination of Thankachan and Larky.

Claims 22 and 43 recite similar features as claim 1 and are considered allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 2-21, 23-42, and 44-47 depend ultimately from claims 1, 22, and 43, and are considered allowable at least because no combination of the cited documents disclose or suggest all the features recited in the independent claims.

Further, with regard to claims 3 and 24, the Action asserts that all the features recited in these claims are shown by the combination of Thankachan and Larky. Claims 3 and 24 recite that at least one keyword is selected by highlighting a portion of text contained in the body of the message's text. The Action points to FIG. 3A, col. 3, l. 56-col. 4, l. 2, and col. 11, ll. 26-33 of Larky for allegedly disclosing this feature. These portions of Larky describe and illustrate a user highlighting phrases or terms that may indicate, in future mails, when an attachment is intended. As described at col. 11, ll. 26-33, the "highlighting" is shown in FIG. 3A for illustrative emphasis to indicate that the certain phrases may provide an implication that an attachment is intended. Nothing in these portions or any other portion of Larky disclose or suggest that at least one keyword is selected by highlighting a portion of text contained in the body of the message's text as set forth in claims 3 and 24. Accordingly, claims 3 and 24 are further considered allowable over Thankachan and Larky for this additional reason.

Also, with regard to claims 5 and 26, the Action asserts that all the features recited in these claims are shown by the combination of Thankachan and Larky. Claims 5 and 26 recite that content of the reference is pasted into the message in response to prompting said messaging system user to select all or a portion of the reference. The Action points to FIG. 3C, col. 10, l. 62 – col. 11, l. 3 and col. 14, ll. 14-20 of Larky as allegedly showing this feature. These portions of Larky describe and illustrate an attach screen button 214C enabling a sender to attach an attachment. Nothing in these portions or any other portions of Larky disclose or suggest that content of the reference is pasted into the message in response to prompting said messaging system user to select all or a portion of the reference as set forth in claims 5 and 26. Accordingly, claims 5 and 26 are further considered allowable over Thankachan and Larky for this additional reason.

With regard to claims 7-12 and 28-33, the Action relies on Danon and Davis for the claimed features missing from Thankachan and Larky. Danon discloses a method and system FIS920030293US1

for communicating, creating, and interacting with content between and among computing devices. Davis discloses client proxying for instant messaging. Neither Danon nor Davis disclose or suggest receiving a request to search a data archive for reference information relating to at least one keyword selected by a messaging system user ... the at least one keyword selected from a body of said message's text, searching the data archive, and, if a reference is found, presenting the reference to the messaging system user within the message as set forth in independent claims 1 and 22. Thus, Danon and Davis fail to make up for the deficiencies of Thankachan and Larky with regard to the features set forth in independent claims 1 and 22, and claims 7-12 and 28-33 are considered allowable over any combination of these documents.

With regard to claims 13 and 34, the Action relies on Danon for the claimed features missing from Thankachan and Larky. As noted above with regard to claims 7-12 and 28-33, Danon fails to make up for the deficiencies of Thankachan and Larky with regard to the features set forth in independent claim 1. Thus, claim 13 and 34 are considered allowable over any combination of these documents for at least this reasons. Furthermore, claims 13 and 34 recite additional features not shown by any combination of these documents. In particular, claims 13 and 34 recite integrating process software for providing the search and reference functions for a messaging system, the integrating comprising, among other features, determining if the process software will execute on at least one server. The Action alleges that this feature is shown in Danon, apparently relying on paragraph 27 of Danon. This portion of Danon describes determining if a new or revised client component is available for downloading from a server. Applicants cannot find a disclosure or suggestion anywhere in Danon of integrating process software for providing said search and reference functions for a messaging system, the integrating comprising determining if the process software will execute on at least one server as set forth in claims 13 and 34. These features are also missing from Thankachan and Larky. Accordingly, claims 13 and 34 are further considered allowable over any combination these documents for this additional reason.

With regard to claims 14-18, 35-39, and 44, the Action relies on Atencio for the claimed features missing from Thankachan and Larky. Atencio discloses a system architecture for self-provisioning services and a method of use. Atencio does not disclose or

suggest receiving a request to search a data archive for reference information relating to at least one keyword selected by a messaging system user ... the at least one keyword selected from a body of said message's text, searching the data archive, and, if a reference is found, presenting the reference to the messaging system user within the message as set forth in independent claims 1, 22, and 43. Thus, Atencio fails to make up for the deficiencies of Thankachan and Larky with regard to the features set forth in independent claims 1, 22, and 43, and claims 14-18, 35-39 and 44 are considered allowable over any combination of these documents.

With regard to claims 19, 20, 40, and 41, the Action relies on Roskind for the claimed features missing from Thankachan and Larky. Roskind discloses an implicit access for a communications pathway. Roskind does not disclose or suggest receiving a request to search a data archive for reference information relating to at least one keyword selected by a messaging system user ... the at least one keyword selected from a body of said message's text, searching the data archive, and, if a reference is found, presenting the reference to the messaging system user within the message as set forth in independent claims 1 and 22. Thus, Roskind fails to make up for the deficiencies of Thankachan and Larky with regard to the features set forth in independent claims 1 and 22, and claims 19, 20, 40 and 41 are considered allowable over any combination of these documents.

With regard to claims 21 and 42, the Action relies on Roskind and Weiss for the features missing from Thankachan and Larky. Weiss discloses a home gateway server appliance. Weiss does not disclose or suggest receiving a request to search a data archive for reference information relating to at least one keyword selected by a messaging system user ... the at least one keyword selected from a body of said message's text, searching the data archive, and, if a reference is found, presenting the reference to the messaging system user within the message as set forth in independent claims 1 and 22. As noted in the previous paragraph, this feature is also missing from Roskind. Thus, Weiss and Roskind fail to make up for the deficiencies of Thankachan and Larky with regard to the features set forth in independent claims 1 and 22, and claims 21 and 42 are considered allowable over any combination of these documents.

As indicated above, new claim 48 recites features similar to those recited in claims 4 and 25 and is considered allowable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Jennifer Pearson Medlin/
Jennifer Pearson Medlin
Registration No. 41,385

Date: August 2, 2007
404-607-9991 (telephone)
404-607-9981 (facsimile)
Customer No. 29371